ICWP Stakeholder Listening and Input Session – Meeting Notes

Tuscaloosa, AL
October 15, 2015

States Attending (14): Alabama, Alaska, Delaware, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia

Question 1: What are the most pressing needs, that if met, would greatly enhance your State's water use data collection program? (List your top 2 or 3.)

Alaska:

1. Web based system for users to upload their data
2. Develop quality assurance (QA) measures w/in the database
3. Get the data so it can be shared easily with USGS and others.

Delaware:

1. Irrigation data – only 30 percent of the farmers participate in reporting.
2. Data processing tools
3. Coordinate Delaware River Basin and USGS data dumps

Michigan:

1. Staff time to follow-up with missing and bad data, and individual attention to reporters

Minnesota:

1. Improve reporting accuracy
2. Standardize metering
3. Education program for metering
4. Timely reporting

Pennsylvania:

1. Outreach to agriculture/irrigators, and industrial users
2. Improve QA of data
3. Improve publicly available data

Virginia:

1. Reporting regulations
2. Deliveries and release
3. Improved water loss data – it is not accurately reported by facility
4. Database work
5. More QA/QC time

Oklahoma:

1. Improving percent of facilities reporting
2. Improve the quality of the data
3. Make data available online (currently working with WADE)
4. Improving estimates for other uses

Louisiana

1. LA has a program with the USGS to collect the data
2. Some QA/QC issues.
3. Develop better coeffiecients
    a. Irrigation (application rates) for rice, crawfish, flooding for duck hunting, seasonal changes

b. Domestic use needs better understanding/estimates.

Alabama

1. Improve database and online reporting
2. Improve agricultural water use reporting. Use estimates to improve QA/QC.
3. Education and outreach on what information needs to be reported, and how to report the data.

Kentucky

1. Better compliance (regarding reporting).
2. Estimates for unreported uses. Required reporting for 10,000gal/d except for Irrigation/Agriculture.
3. Reporting withdrawals, but not how it's being used.
4. Better return values, basin budgets.

Maine

1. Need web base water reporting tool
2. Limited required reporting – need outreach
3. Self-supplied domestic estimates

Mississippi

1. Similar to KY and AL
2. Need better reporting
3. Increase participation
4. Improve quality of reported data
    a. Online system
    b. They have an online metered agricultural/irrigation reporting, but need to develop the same for industrial and public supply.
5. Work on estimation tools.

New Jersey

1. NJ has a well-established reporting system.
2. Need to show the value and usefulness of the data
3. Outreach

Question 2 – How do the research priorities identified by USGS align with State priorities?

1. HUC 8 water-use reporting
2. Water-tracking and interbasin transfer (between HUC 8 units)
3. System uses (internal and other non-revenue uses) and losses from public supply systems
4. Irrigation: sources and volumes (including golf courses)
5. Inventory of self-supplied industrial
6. Mining: withdrawals with source and commodity identified
7. Improvement of the domestic per capita coefficients
8. Groundwater use: Identifying aquifer and HUC of withdrawal, and further refining the definition of saline/brackish water
9. Estimation of public supply deliveries to customer groups or classes, such as commercial, industrial, and domestic
10. Public supply systems stratified by socioeconomic factors
11. Improved data collection and delivery

For this meeting, each state listed the numbers for the top three priorities for the state that were in the list above.

Alaska	11, 8, 10
Delaware	4, 3, 9
Michigan	11, 2 (water tracking cradle to grave), 9
Minnesota	11, 3, 9 (reuse w/in categories), 7, 5
Pennsylvania	11, 3 (AWWA water audit), 4 (golf courses)
Virginia	
Oklahoma	11 (irrigation), 3 (water for 2060 initiative), 7
Louisiana	3, 4, 7, 9
Alabama	11, 4, 2 (estimating population served), 8
Kentucky	3, 9, 2 (withdrawals and returns, HUC-6 for interbasin transfers), IR (an emergence of aggressive irrigation)
Maine	11, 4, 7
Mississippi	11, 4, 8
New Jersey	9 (summer peak demands), 3 (old urban infrastructure), 2 (basin tracking), 8 (groundwater fresh vs. groundwater saline)
Tennessee	

Additionally, the three items below were listed as priorities, but not on the list above:

1. Methodologies for water budgets. This might include mathematical computations in the database. It would also include a way to tease out a separation between use and loss.
2. Improved temporal data (monthly, seasonal)
3. Outreach – educating personnel reporting the data as to how to accurately report the data.

Question 3 – Does your state currently meet the baseline standard listed in the WUDR Guidance? If yes, what Tier do you think you state currently meets?

Question 4 – For the FY16 competitive award, how do you think financial assistance should be prioritized among the Tiers?

- Equal priority
- A greater priority to assist states in meeting baseline standards
- A greater priority to assist states in meeting the higher-level Tiers

Some states thought that the funding should go mostly to higher tier levels. Others thought it should go more towards meeting tier 1 requirements. Others thought they should get equal priority. There was no consensus as to which of the three options listed above would be the best.

Question 5 – Given the maximum funding for FY16 ($1.5 million – pending Congressional approval), what is the minimum level of award you would find to be helpful to your state?

The general consensus was that the minimum funding amount would be $25,000 to $30,000. A few states thought the minimum should be $100,000.

Question 6 – Is your state able to meet the requirements listed in the WUDR Guidance?

- All data must be stored in an electronic format.
- A description of methods used to estimate values, coefficients, and/or other data must be provided.
- A description of data quality assurance and control procedures must be provided.
- Non-sensitive data, that is available for export or download from the state agency database, must be accessible to the USGS
- The data must be made available to the USGS at the HUC8, county level, and aquifer (for groundwater sources).
- Interaction with USGS Water Science Center personnel is required.

This question was not discussed at this meeting.

Question 7 – Following an award of FY16 competitive funds, states will likely be required to periodically report their progress. What reporting frequency do you think is appropriate?

Quarterly or semi-annual reporting frequency was suggested.

Question 8 – What would be most helpful in making the FY16 proposal/application process more clear/easier?

- The basics - executive summary, description of activities, budget, timeline, deliverables + page number limit
- USGS to provide an outline/template of application requirements – more prescribed
- Criteria for how proposals will be evaluated
- Just let us do our thing!

It was suggested that the proposal be prescribed to better enable evaluation of the proposals, and be sure the evaluation criteria are included.

Afternoon Discussion:

Case study presentation – Lessons learned from ongoing regional water use data collections efforts (Water Atlas of the Eastern Region (WATER))

After the presentation, preliminary results of the survey conducted by ICWP were viewed. Participation in the survey has been really good so far, and the results are detailed and interesting.

Wrap-Up

There was some general discussion of the meeting.

Discussion included the idea that an information exchange between the states would be beneficial. There was also a discussion regarding data accessibility, and what is the endpoint from the USGS perspective.